

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CRUZ GARDUNO GONZALEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

E056982

(Super.Ct.No. RIF1103486)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Jean P. Leonard, Judge.

Affirmed.

Patricia M. Ihara, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Cruz Garduno Gonzalez was charged with one count of lewd and lascivious acts on a child under the age of 14 (Pen. Code, § 288, subd. (a))¹, two counts of oral copulation or sexual penetration by a person 18 years or older with a child under the age of 10 (§ 288.7, subdivision (b)), and one count of sexual intercourse or sodomy by a person 18 years or older with a child under the age of 10 (§ 288.7, subd. (a)).

Pursuant to a plea bargain, defendant pleaded guilty to two counts of oral copulation or sexual penetration on a child under the age of 10. (§ 288.7, subd. (b).) He agreed to a sentence of 30 years to life, consisting of two consecutive terms of 15 years to life. The court found a factual basis for the plea and imposed the agreed-upon sentence, including appropriate credits, and dismissed the remaining counts.

Defendant filed a timely notice of appeal from the sentence or other matters occurring after the plea. We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record. We offered defendant the opportunity to file any supplemental brief he deemed necessary. Defendant did not file a supplemental brief.

We have examined the entire record and have found no sentencing error nor any other post-plea error. We are satisfied that defendant's attorney has fully complied with

¹ All statutory citations refer to the Penal Code.

her responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist.² (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

McKINSTER
J.

We concur:

HOLLENHORST
Acting P. J.

CODRINGTON
J.

² By correspondence with the trial court, counsel for defendant obtained correction of a clerical error in the abstract of judgment prior to the filing of the opening brief.